

## REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the application identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the above amendments, claim 23 has been amended for readability purposes, and claim 24 has been amended in a manner consistent with claim 23. Such claims have only been amended for readability purposes and as such, no new matter is being presented by the above amendments.

Applicants note that to date, no indication has been provided by the Patent Office concerning the entry of the Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.312 filed on March 24, 2009. As such, in view of the reopening of prosecution, the amendments set forth in the Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.312 are being resubmitted by the present paper. Specifically, the specification has been amended at page 1 to correct a clerical error. Claims 15, 16 and 18 have been amended for readability purposes by deleting parantheticals therefrom.

In the Official Action, claims 13-18 and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The Patent Office has taken the position that it is not clear from claim 23 if "two fluids are injected into each of the two zones or two wells or if one fluid into each for a total of two streams." See Official Action at page 2. Claim 23 has been amended to explicitly recite "injecting at least two inflow fluid streams into at least two production zones of an oil producing well linked to the oilfield, respectively, or into at least two oil producing wells, respectively." Thus, it is clear that such claim does not require that

two fluid streams be injected into each zone or well. Rather, in accordance with such claim recitation, at least one fluid stream is injected into each zone or well.

Claim 23 has also been rejected for reciting the phrase "wherein at least two outflow streams from the at least two zones or wells are combined before recovering." Such phrase has been deleted by the above amendments, and claim 23 has been amended to recite "combining the at least two outflow streams from the at least two zones or wells to form a combined outflow stream", and "recovering the combined outflow stream of fluid comprising the oil and amounts of the at least two scale inhibitors."

The Patent Office has further rejected claim 23 for reciting injecting inflow fluid streams into both zones or wells. The recitation of injecting inflow fluid streams into both zones or wells, however, does not render claim 23 indefinite. The meaning of the recited terms "zones" and "wells" is clear. The meaning of the recited injection of an inflow fluid stream into a zone or well, is also clear. Simply put, there is nothing improper with the recitation of injecting inflow fluid streams into both zones or wells.

For at least the above reasons, it is apparent that the claims fully comply with the provisions set forth in 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.


If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 28, 2009

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Roger H. Lee", is written over a horizontal line.

Roger H. Lee  
Registration No. 46317

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620